

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,411	02/06/2002	Jamie J. McNutt	P99047US2A	4690
7590 07/06/2004			EXAMINER	
	irestone Americas Hold	WYROZEBSKI LEE, KATARZYNA I		
Chief Intellectual Property Counsel 1200 Firestone Parkway Akron, OH 44317-0001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1714	

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/068,411	MCNUTT ET AL	
Examiner	Art Unit	191
Katarzyna Wyrozebski	1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address

THE REPLY FILED 10 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date se no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS 706.07(f).	mailing date of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	g amount of the fee. The appropriate extension reply originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within t 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismis	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or sea	rch (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);	•
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by issues for appeal; and/or	materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number NOTE:	er of finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	n a separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been application in condition for allowance because: see attachment to the advisory.	considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOL raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:	
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-15</u> .	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>16</u> .	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved	d by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No.	o(s)
10. Other:	
	Katarzyna Wyrozebski
	Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1714

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Application/Control Number: 10/068,411

Art Unit: 1714

Attachment to the Advisory

In view of the applicant's response to the Final Office action, the response being mailed on 6/10/2004, the amendment is entered. Applicant's arguments were considered but not persuasive. The rejections of record are not overcome and are incorporated here by reference.

In the response filed on 6/10/2004 the applicant argued following:

a) The applicants disagree with USPTO's interpretation of col 5, lines 3-6 of the KATIHARA reference, since each rubber used for specific tire component will be highly engineered for that component.

With respect to the above argument, it is examiner's position that the applicant's claims that only require rubber and carbon black in itself allow very high degree of engineering.

Applicants independent claims are open to practically any type of rubber. In addition applicant's independent claim 9 lists also different parts of the tire that the composition can be utilized in.

For example, chafer extends into the sidewall, and abrasion can include even tire tread, since tire tread has to have abrasive properties.

b) The properties of the applicants examples are different from the examples of the prior art of record. The components are utilized in different amounts.

With respect to the above argument, the only amounts or numerical values that the independent claims refer to is DBP value of carbon black. Claims of the present invention are

Application/Control Number: 10/068,411

Art Unit: 1714

open to any amount even that disclosed in the prior art, therefore it also encompasses properties. The attached properties and the composition that the applicants have submitted from the publication of Rubber Formulary cannot be compared since they are not the same compositions and they do not contain large size carbon black as disclosed in the prior art. The disclosure of LAUBE also discloses use of rubbers that are preferred by the present invention, therefore one example of LAUBE that the applicants refer to is not representative of the entire invention of the prior art.

c) The tire inner liner and the bead filler compositions are not interchangeable.

With respect to the above argument, if the composition comprises only a soft rubber such as halogenated butyl rubber, then yes, however if the prior art of record teaches use of hard rubbers such as SBR, then the examiner disagrees.

If applicants feel that an interview can resolve pending issues they are welcome to call the examiner for an interview.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Katarzyna Wyrozebski whose telephone number is (571) 272-1127. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 6:30 AM-4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/068,411

Art Unit: 1714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Katarzyna Wyrozebski

Primary Examin

June 29, 2004